
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 8 October 2019

by **S J Lee BA(Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 October 2019

Appeal A Ref: APP/R3650/W/19/3230227

Land East of Benbow Lane, Dunsfold Road, Alfold

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by The Trustees Brian, Kevin and Daniel Hunt of The Wings Museum against the decision of Waverley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref WA/2016/1954, dated 19 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 7 December 2018.
 - The development proposed is erection of a building to accommodate a museum (Use Class D1) with ancillary parking and access.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/R3650/W/19/3230229

Land East of Benbow Lane, Dunsfold Road, Alfold

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by The Trustees Brian, Kevin and Daniel Hunt of The Wings Museum against the decision of Waverley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref WA/2016/1976, dated 19 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 7 December 2018.
 - The development proposed is change of use from disused aerodrome to nature reserve.
-

Decision

1. Appeal A is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of a building to accommodate a museum (Use Class D1) with ancillary parking and access at Land East of Benbow Lane, Dunsfold Road, Alfold in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref WA/2016/1954, dated 19 August 2016, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.
2. Appeal B is allowed and planning permission is granted for change of use from disused aerodrome to nature reserve at Land East of Benbow Lane, Dunsfold Road, Alfold in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref WA/2016/1976, dated 19 August 2016, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Procedural Matters

3. The application for Appeal A was submitted in outline with all matters reserved. I have considered the appeal on this basis and have treated all plans as indicative only. The Council has also notified me that there is an error in the decision notice. This refers to Policy RE2 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan Part 1: Strategic Policies and Sites (LPP1)(2018). The correct reference should

be Policy RE1 (Countryside beyond the Green Belt). I have taken account of this below.

4. The Council has indicated that in the event of Appeal A being allowed, subject to measures requiring parking being in place, their objections to Appeal B would fall away. I have had regard to this in my decision.

Main Issues

5. The main issues for Appeal A are (i) the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area and (ii) whether the development would be in an appropriate location with regard to relevant development plan policies.
6. The main issue for Appeal B is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Appeal A – Character and Appearance

7. The appeal site is a large, overgrown and unmaintained area of open scrub land. There are no signs of any current or recent use. The site is located adjacent to Dunsfold Park aerodrome, which is allocated in the LPP1 for a new settlement under Policy SS7. This covers a significant area directly abutting the north and east of the appeal site. The policy includes provision for land to be reserved on, or adjoining, the site for the provision of a museum reflecting the site's history as an aviation centre. The allocated site currently has part outline and part full planning permission for a large mixed-use development. Immediately to the west is the site of the proposed nature reserve covered by Appeal B. The appeal site itself is not allocated for development or subject to any landscape classifications. An 'Area of Great Landscape Value' (AGLV) is however near to the site.
8. There are two small structures and hardstanding on the site remaining from its historical use. Much of the site shows no signs of any previous man-made uses or activity. The site has therefore predominantly returned to a largely natural appearance. Thus, I have given limited weight to any arguments relating to the use of previously developed land. However, this is not a decisive factor. There is also little evidence that the site has been used for agricultural purposes. As such, objections made on this basis have had no bearing on my decision.
9. The indicative plans show a large building of around 10,000 square metres, with associated access roads and parking. Ostensibly this would be built over multiple phases. Although detailed design and layout are reserved matters, it is clear the expectation would be for a building or buildings of significant size, along with associated access, parking and servicing areas. A building of some size might be expected when considering what is to be exhibited.
10. The development would result in a significant amount of clearance of existing vegetation and an obvious urbanisation of the site. As well as large areas of unmaintained scrub, bushes and immature self-setting trees, the indicative plans suggest there could be some potential for the removal of an existing bank of mature trees toward the west of the site, close to one of the existing structures. Taken together, this would inevitably diminish the existing open

and undeveloped character of the site and the contribution it makes to the rural character of the area.

11. However, the exact level of tree or other vegetation removal would be considered at reserved matters stage. There would therefore be opportunities to consider the specific impact from any layout at this stage. This would include assessment of the impact on any particular groups of trees. While some loss of trees is inevitable, when considering the size of the site, I am satisfied that there would be reasonable scope for a form of development that would not result in unacceptable harm to mature or ancient woodland.
12. While the change in character of the site would be significant, the actual impact of this would be generally quite localised. The site is relatively self-enclosed and there is already significant screening from mature landscaping that would largely be retained. This would provide a high degree of mitigation. Depending on scale and layout, there would possibly be glimpsed views from Dunsfold Road through the trees and any access points. These would also be generally fleeting in nature from passing traffic.
13. Views from the existing aerodrome site are likely to be most affected by the development. However, the character of this site is also likely to change to a considerable degree. While the proposed new settlement is likely to come forward over a considerable period, the museum would be seen in this wider context. It is highly likely that over time the development would be seen as part of the wider changes in the area and this would serve to reduce its overall impact on local character. The above factors are all significant considerations in assessing the scale and severity of any harm caused.
14. There is no requirement in Policy SS7 for a landscape buffer around the site. Nevertheless, most of the area included in the two appeals would remain open and undeveloped. The parties have also drawn my attention to an illustrative masterplan and parameters plan for the new settlement. While this may be subject to change, it is clear from these and the relevant policies, that the new settlement is expected to contain large areas of open space and landscaping. The area around the allocation is also predominantly open countryside. The development would affect only a small part of this. I therefore see no unacceptable harm being caused in respect of a landscape buffer to the new settlement.
15. The appellant has submitted a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) which sought to consider the impact of the development on wider landscape character, including the setting of the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). This concluded that the development would have no undue impacts on either factor. I saw nothing to come to a different conclusion.
16. From higher ground some distance from the site, it is possible that the parts of any new buildings would be visible to an extent. For example, there are wide, sweeping panoramic views from Hascombe Hill which take in the site. However, I saw that these views contain a varied landscape character, with a mixture of woodland, farmland and scattered buildings, including some large agricultural structures. As with the local setting, any buildings on the site would be well screened by the substantial amount of existing tree cover around the site and in intervening views. Moreover, even from longer distance views the development would continue to be seen in the context of the new settlement. The impact of any new building in these wider panoramic views

would not be significant and the overall character of the landscape would not be harmed to any material degree.

17. The appellant's Transport Assessment (TA) suggests that during the busy summer period, the estimated maximum number of trips generated per day would be around 224. This averages out to around 25 trips per hour during opening hours. The maximum number of trips for any one hour is estimated to be 40. These figures have not been disputed by the Council or Highway Authority and there is no substantive evidence to suggest this is not a robust assessment. The overall impact from traffic on the tranquillity of the area is likely to be negligible. Even allowing for some error in the TA, it is unlikely that the additional trips generated would have a material impact on the rural character of the area. Suggested conditions relating to coach parking would further mitigate any potential harm.
18. In addition, both short and long-distance views into the appeal site could benefit from additional landscaping to be agreed at reserved matters stage. Consideration would also be given at this stage to the design, height and footprint of any building, as well as the materials used and the details of associated paraphernalia, such as signage. There is no reason in principle why a good standard of design could not be achieved on the site that seeks to minimise the impact of development.
19. Nonetheless, the development would clearly diminish the existing rural, open and undeveloped character of the site. This weighs against the development to an extent. However, when considered in the context of the new settlement and associated development, including the requirement for open spaces and a country park, the policy provision allowing for a museum adjoining the allocated site, the open and undeveloped nature of the proposed nature reserve, the degree of screening that currently exists and the potential to consider additional mitigation through reserved matters applications, I am not convinced that these changes would amount to unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area, including the AGLV and the setting of the AONB.
20. Consequently, there would no overriding conflict with policies RE1, RE3 or TD1 of the LPP1 or policies D1 and D4 of the Waverley Local Plan (2002)(LP) which seek, amongst other things, to protect the intrinsic beauty of the countryside, the setting of the AONB and resist harm to the visual character and distinctiveness of a locality.

Appeal A – Policy

21. As already noted, Policy SS7 allows for a new museum on, or adjoining, the allocated site. The development would clearly meet this requirement. There is nothing in the policy which suggests a strong preference for a museum on the allocated site. Neither is there any sort of 'sequential' mechanism in the policy for determining whether the museum should be located within the allocation or adjoining it.
22. The Council has drawn my attention to the existing museum on the allocation and the fact the outline permission allows for up to 9,750 square metres of Use Class D1 floorspace. I recognise that it is theoretically possible for a museum to be accommodated within this space. However, the appellant has drawn my attention to supporting documents for the original permission which suggests

the majority of the floorspace has been earmarked for other uses in the D1 use class, including a new school. While recognising part of the permission is in outline only and there are opportunities to amend the scheme through reserved matters, there is therefore no strong evidence that a museum is intended to form part of the permitted scheme.

23. Whether or not the developer of the new settlement wishes to include a museum in the final scheme, it is not inconsistent with Policy SS7 for provision to be made for a museum on adjoining land. I have also noted comments that suggest it was always intended for the museum to be integrated into the new settlement. However, this is not what the policy states. As such, I see no reason to conclude that allowing the appeal would be premature. Moreover, I see no particular reason why allowing the appeal would diminish the overall quality of the new settlement or detract from the history of the site.
24. There is much debate in the evidence about the historical significance of the appeal site and its links to aviation. The appellant has provided some evidence which suggests a previous connection between the site and the wider aerodrome use. As far as I have been made aware, there is no requirement in Policy SS7 for the site 'adjoining' Dunsfold Park to have any links to aviation or World War II. In any event, the site is sufficiently close to the existing Dunsfold Park site to ensure the historic connection between the museum and the allocation remains. Although not decisive, these factors still add some weight in favour of the proposal.
25. Although not directly related to this reason for refusal, I also see no reason why this development would in any way prejudice the general development of the new settlement. Planning permission already exists and there appears to be nothing preventing delivery of the permitted scheme. The Council has raised no objections in relation to potential impacts on highways or other matters that might adversely affect delivery, including the living conditions of future residents. I see no reason to come to a different conclusion on these issues.
26. There is no minimum or maximum size requirement for a museum in Policy SS7. While the proposal is substantially larger than what currently exists, this is no basis to on which to withhold permission. Any buildings are likely to come forward in phases and presumably the scale of any building will be dependent on what is likely to be exhibited. I am satisfied by the appellant's evidence that the scale of development envisaged is not unreasonable in this regard. There is also nothing in Policy SS7 which stipulates the museum must be operated by those currently operating the existing museum or anybody connected to the new settlement development. These factors do not therefore weigh against the development.
27. The question before me is whether a museum in this location could, in principle, meet the requirements of the policy in terms of location and content. There is nothing before me which suggests that this could not be achieved in principle. The Council has also suggested a condition which would require the museum to exhibit items related to the site which would provide a degree of additional control and comfort that the requirements of the policy would be met.

28. In conclusion on this matter, I find that the development would conform with the requirements of LPP1 Policy SS7 which seeks, amongst other things, the provision of a museum on land within or adjoining the allocation.

Appeal B – Character and Appearance

29. The Council's only objection to this proposal was an apparent lack of specific parking facilities for the nature reserve. The concern was that parking on the road would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. No objections were made because of highway safety.
30. The Council's appeal statement and officer report suggests that the nature reserve would not provide any parking of its own and would rely on the museum's car park. This does not appear to tally with the submitted plans, which include both a new access and small car park within the 'red line' of the application. The main vehicular access is shown to be in the same location as that on the indicative plans for the museum proposal. Nevertheless, even if this were not the case, as I am minded allowing Appeal A, provision for parking would be made in any event.
31. I am therefore satisfied that sufficient parking provision can be provided for the nature reserve and that this can be required by condition. As such, there would be no particular risk of vehicles parking on Dunsfold Road or any associated impacts on the character and appearance of the area. There would therefore be no conflict with policies RE1, TD1 and ST1 of the LPP1, which seek amongst other things, to protect the intrinsic beauty of the countryside and ensure parking is provided.

Other Matters

Appeal A and Appeal B

32. The Highway Authority did not object to either proposal. This is a material consideration of substantial weight. There would be sufficient scope to provide adequate parking and ensure a satisfactory access could be created. I have seen nothing to suggest the nature or surface of Dunsfold Road is inherently unsafe or that it could not cope with the additional traffic proposed. I am therefore satisfied that there would be no severe transport issues or unacceptable safety risks, either individually or in combination with other developments.
33. The museum would not be in a particularly accessible location and most trips to it would be likely to be by car. While the likely increase in car use to this area would weigh against the development to an extent, this would likely to have been the case whether the museum was on this site or the allocation. It is reasonable to assume therefore that a certain level of trip generation would have been expected.
34. The appellant's Ecological Appraisal (EA), which covered the Appeal A and Appeal B sites, identified some potential impacts relating to protected species and other biodiversity assets. This includes potential impacts on Great Crested Newts (GCN), mammals, reptiles, nesting birds and potential impacts on foraging habitats for badgers and bats. The biodiversity value varies across the two sites, as does the likely impact of development. The assessment concludes the potential impacts can be adequately mitigated and recommends measures

- to both maintain and enhance biodiversity. There is nothing to suggest this is not a robust assessment.
35. The EA sets out several recommendations and mitigation measures that could be undertaken. This would include the translocation of populations of GCN and other reptiles into the adjacent 'nature reserve'. Surrey Wildlife Trust has also suggested conditions. The mitigation works would be likely to require a European Protected Species (EPS) licence from Natural England, particularly in relation to any need to translocate GCN. Any grant of such a licence would be outside the scope of this appeal. However, Natural England did not object to the development on these grounds and I am reasonably satisfied that there is potential for a licence to be granted for these measures.
36. The EA considered potential impacts on the Chiddingfold Forest SSSI would be minimal and there would unlikely to be any effects on other designated Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs) in the area. I am satisfied that this is a robust assessment of the likely risks and that controls could be put in place during construction to minimise the risk of impact.
37. Overall, the EA provides sufficient comfort over the scale of the any impacts, the likely long-term effects on biodiversity if the sites are left unmanaged and the mitigation that might be possible, including making use of the 'nature reserve' site and scope for enhancements as part of the museum development. Conditions will be necessary to ensure such measures are put in place prior to development taking place, but on balance I am satisfied that these would be enough to adequately address potential impacts. Again, any particular impacts relating to the final layout of development would need to be assessed at reserved matters stage. However, based on the indicative plans, I am satisfied the development need not result in unacceptable harm.
38. Concerns have been raised that the museum development would not be viable. Even if this were a significant material consideration, there is no substantive evidence before me that the development is unlikely to be able to proceed. As such, this has had no bearing on my decision. Other than in relation to mitigating potential impacts, I also see no particular reason why the development of the museum should be dependent on the delivery of the nature reserve. While the latter would provide some obvious benefits in terms of biodiversity and recreation, I do not see it as a critical part of the justification for the museum.
39. In coming to my decision, I have had regard to some of the benefits identified. These include improving the tourism offer in the district and improving the offer in relation to the appellant's existing museum. The development would also provide jobs, both in the short and long term. The provision of the nature reserve provides opportunities to maintain and enhance the biodiversity value of the area and provide recreation space for residents. These are positive factors that weigh in favour of the proposal. The need to establish a management protocol for the nature reserve is acknowledged, but this can be required by condition.
40. Taking all relevant matters into account, I am satisfied there are no material considerations that would lead me to a decision other than in accordance with the development plan.

Conditions

Appeal A - Conditions

41. I have considered the suggested conditions in accordance with the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). In addition to the standard conditions on timescales, I have attached a condition confirming the approved plan as this provides certainty.
42. Condition 5 is necessary to establish the parameters for the design of the roof in any reserved matters application. This is in the interests of the character and appearance of the area. Condition 6 is necessary to ensure compliance with Policy SS7. I have however amended the condition so that it includes reference to the museum 'predominantly' reflecting Dunsfold Aerodrome's history as an aviation centre. While recognising the justification for the development comes from Policy SS7, I see no reason why other aviation related artefacts could not be displayed in an ancillary or complementary manner. I am satisfied a condition of this sort would be enforceable by reference to any link between the proportion of space given over to certain exhibits and their documented links to the aviation history of the area.
43. The Council's suggested condition includes provision for demolition of any building 6 months in the event the use ceases. I am not convinced this element has been justified as being necessary. Subject to reserved matters applications, there should be no concerns over impact on local character. Furthermore, should alternative uses be proposed for the building, assessments could be made at the time in relation to the appropriateness of the use for that particular location. I have not therefore imposed the requirement for demolition.
44. Condition 7 is necessary to provide adequate assessment of impact on any trees at reserved matters stage. Conditions 8- 13 are all necessary in the interests of the character of the area and to protect the living conditions of future residents of the new settlement.
45. Conditions 14 - 19 are necessary in the interests of highway and pedestrian safety. Access and layout are reserved matters and thus there are no 'approved plans' for either the access or pedestrian link conditions. The suggested conditions are not therefore implementable. I have amended them to ensure the access and pedestrian link are implemented prior to the commencement of the use.
46. Condition 19 - 21 are necessary to ensure contamination is adequately assessed and dealt with. Conditions 22 and 23 are necessary to ensure the site is adequately drained. Condition 24 is necessary to ensure any potential archaeological assets are properly investigated. In the interests of precision, I have amended the suggested condition to include more detail on what a written scheme of investigation might include.
47. Conditions 25 to 28 are necessary to protect, mitigate or enhance biodiversity. I am satisfied that such measures would be capable of providing appropriate protection for any biodiversity assets that might exist on the site. I have amended the suggested condition requiring a Landscape and Ecological Masterplan (LEMP) to include a requirement for a timetable of works to be included. This will ensure the Council has control over when mitigation

measures are implemented prior to development commencing. The Council's suggested conditions 26 and 30 duplicate the provision of others and thus I have not imposed them.

48. I have not imposed the Council's suggested condition 7. This would require the implementation of the nature reserve prior to construction of the museum. The reasons given for this were to allow for mitigation of impacts on biodiversity and to retain a landscape buffer. However, with or without the formal implementation of a nature reserve, the land under the appellant's control would still be able to meet both objectives. The requirement to submit details of mitigation through the LEMP, and an associated timetable for implementation, should provide the same level of protection.

Appeal B – Conditions

49. As with Appeal A, I have imposed standard conditions on timescales and plans as these provide certainty. Although not directly suggested by the Council, I have noted the suggested conditions from the Highway Authority relating to access and parking. Such factors were addressed to an extent by suggested conditions, but I consider the ones imposed to be clearer and more precise. These are necessary to ensure highway safety and to reduce potential impacts on local character. Details are required to be approved, as the submitted plans for the nature reserve do not identify full details of the access or parking areas.
50. In the interests of character and appearance I have also imposed a condition requiring details of footpaths, street furniture and signage to be agreed prior to the nature reserve being open to the public. I have amended this in light of other conditions. In the interests of biodiversity, I have imposed a condition requiring the submission and approval of a LEMP for the site. I have amended this so that what it contains is consistent that imposed for Appeal A. Although the mitigation and measures required may differ between sites, it is nevertheless important that there is provision for the monitoring and management of the nature reserve moving forward. As with Appeal A, the measures should be consistent with what is in the EA.
51. For both appeals, other than where mentioned specifically above, I have made several additional alterations to conditions in the interests of clarity and precision. All pre-commencement conditions identified are necessary to ensure the developments proceed in accordance with approved details.

Conclusion

52. For the reasons given above I therefore conclude that both Appeal A and Appeal B should be allowed.

S J Lee

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions – Appeal A

- 1) Details of the access, appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale, (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before any development takes place and the development shall be carried out as approved.
- 2) Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the local planning authority not later than 3 years from the date of this permission.
- 3) The development hereby permitted shall take place not later than 2 years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.
- 4) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: PLE/2016/1022 Location Plan (Scale 1:2500).
- 5) Detailed designs for the roof of any building to be submitted in accordance with condition 2 shall incorporate recessive roof colouring and/or comprise a planted 'green' roof.
- 6) The development hereby approved shall not be used other than for an aviation museum predominantly reflecting Dunsfold Aerodrome's history as an aviation centre and for no other purpose (including any other purpose or type of museum in Class D1 (non-residential institutions) within the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987, or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification).
- 7) The plans and particulars submitted in accordance with condition 2 shall include:
 - (a) A plan showing the location of, and allocating a reference number to each existing tree on the site which has a stem with a diameter measured over the bark at a point 1.5 metres above ground level exceeding 75mm, showing which trees are to be retained and the crown spread of each retained tree;
 - (b) Details of the species, diameter (measured in accordance with criterion (a)) and the approximate height, and an assessment of the general state of health and stability of each retained tree and of each tree which is on land adjacent to the site and to which criteria (c) and (d) apply;
 - (c) Details of any proposed topping or lopping of any retained tree or of any tree on land adjacent to the site;
 - (d) Details of any proposed alterations in existing ground levels, and of the position of any proposed excavation within the crown spread of any retained tree or of any tree on land adjacent to the site;
 - (e) Details of the specification and position of fencing and of any other measures to be taken for the protection of any retained tree from damage before or during the course of development.
- 8) No development shall take place until a scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority which specifies the provisions to be made for the control of noise emanating from the

site, such as from fixed and mobile plant. The use shall not commence until the scheme has been fully implemented in accordance with the approved details. The use shall continue to operate in accordance with the approved details thereafter.

- 9) The development hereby permitted shall not be open for customers outside the following hours: 0800 – 1800 Mondays – Sundays, including Public Holidays.
- 10) All plant, machinery and equipment installed or operated in connection with the carrying out of this permission shall be so enclosed and/or attenuated so that the rating level of noise emitted does not exceed the background sound level, when measured according to British Standard BS4142:2014 at any adjoining or nearby noise sensitive premises.
- 11) No machinery shall be operated which is audible outside the site boundary outside the following hours:
0800-1800: Mondays to Fridays
0800-1300: Saturdays
Not at all on Sundays or Public Holidays
- 12) No deliveries shall be taken at or dispatched from the site outside the following hours:
0800-1800: Mondays to Fridays
0800-1300: Saturdays
Not at all on Sundays or Public Holidays
- 13) No sound reproduction or amplification equipment (including public address systems, tannoy system, loudspeakers etc) which is audible outside the site boundary shall be installed or operated on the site.
- 14) The development hereby approved shall not be commenced unless and until a satisfactory vehicular access to Dunsfold Road has been constructed in accordance with details to be submitted in accordance with condition 2. Thereafter the access shall be retained and maintained for its designated purpose.
- 15) The development hereby approved shall not be brought into use unless and until a footway connecting the site's main vehicular access and Dunsfold Park's 'Tickners Heath' vehicular access has been constructed. The footway shall be constructed in accordance with details to be provided under condition 2. Thereafter the footway shall be retained and maintained for its designated purpose.
- 16) The development hereby approved shall not be brought into use unless and until space has been laid out within the site for vehicles to be parked and for vehicles to turn so that they may enter and exit the site in a forward gear in accordance with details to be provided in accordance with condition 2. Thereafter the parking and turning areas shall be retained and maintained for their designated purposes.
- 17) No development shall take place until a Construction Transport Management Plan, to include details of:
 - (a) Parking for vehicles of site personnel, operatives and visitors;

- (b) Loading and unloading of plant and materials;
- (c) Storage of plant and materials;
- (d) Measures to prevent the deposit of materials on the highway;
- (e) Before and after construction condition surveys of the highway;
- (f) On-site turning for construction vehicles;

has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

- 18) The development hereby approved shall not be brought into use unless and until a parking management plan is submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This plan shall contain measures for ensuring that no more than four coaches are allowed access to the museum on any one day. The approved plan shall then be implemented on occupation of the development and thereafter maintained in accordance with the approved details.
- 19) Prior to commencement of development, other than that to be carried out as part of an approved scheme of remediation, the following shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:
- (a) An investigation and risk assessment, in accordance with a scheme to assess the nature and extent of any contamination on the site, whether or not it originates on the site. The investigation and risk assessment shall be undertaken by a competent person as defined in Annex 2: Glossary of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).
 - (b) If identified to be required, a detailed remediation scheme shall be prepared to bring the site to a condition suitable for the intended use by removing unacceptable risks to human health, buildings and other property. The scheme shall include:
 - (i) All works to be undertaken
 - (ii) Proposed remediation objectives and remediation criteria
 - (iii) A timetable of works
 - (iv) Site management procedures

The scheme shall ensure that the site will not qualify as contaminated land under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 in relation to the intended use of the land after remediation. The remediation works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme. The local planning authority shall be given two weeks written notification of commencement of the remediation scheme works.

- 20) Upon completion of any approved remediation works, a verification report demonstrating the effectiveness of the approved remediation works carried out shall be submitted to the local planning authority.
- 21) Following commencement of the development hereby approved, if unexpected contamination is found on site at any time, other than that identified in accordance with Condition 19, the local planning authority shall be immediately notified in writing and all works shall be halted on

- the site. The following shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the recommencement of works:
- (a) An investigation and risk assessment, undertaken in the manner set out in Condition 19(a) of this permission.
 - (b) Where required, a remediation scheme in accordance with the requirements as set out in Condition 19(b).
 - (c) Following completion of approved remediation works, a verification report, in accordance with the requirements as set out in Condition 20.
- 22) The development hereby permitted shall not commence until details of the design of a surface water drainage scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the planning authority. Those details shall include:
- (a) A design that is compliant with the national Non-Statutory Technical Standards for Sustainable Drainage, National Planning Policy Framework and Ministerial Statement on Sustainable Drainage. The design will satisfy the Sustainable Drainage Hierarchy and include results from infiltration testing.
 - (b) Evidence that the proposed solution will effectively manage the 1 in 30 & 1 in 100 (+Climate change allowance) for storm events, during all stages of the development (Pre, Post and during) and follows the principles detailed in "The SUDS Proforma dated 30/09/2016 and Supporting calculations"
 - (c) Details of how the Sustainable Drainage System will cater for system failure or exceedance events, both on and offsite
 - (d) Details of how the Sustainable Drainage System will be protected and maintained during the construction of the development
 - (e) Finalised drawings read for construction to include: a finalised drainage layout detailing the location of Sustainable Drainage elements, pipe diameters and their respective levels and long and cross sections of each Sustainable Drainage element including details of flow restrictions
 - (f) A management and maintenance plan that details maintenance regimes and responsibilities
- 23) Prior to the first occupation of the development, a verification report carried out by a qualified drainage engineer must be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority to demonstrate that the Sustainable Drainage System has been constructed as per the agreed scheme.
- 24) No development shall take place until a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include an assessment of significance and research questions - and:
- (a) the programme and methodology of site investigation and recording;
 - (b) the programme for post investigation assessment;

- (c) the provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording;
 - (d) the provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation;
 - (e) the provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation;
 - (f) the nomination of a competent person or persons/organization to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation.
- 25) Prior to the commencement of development, a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) based on the recommendations of Section 5 'Discussion, Recommendations and Conclusions' of the Ecological Appraisal report authored by Land Use Consultants dated August 2016 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The LEMP should also include details of the following;
- (a) Description and evaluation of proposed mitigation measures, and features to be managed and created, including measures for;
 - i. Mitigation and/or compensation for loss of proposed scrub, tree and hedge removal
 - ii. Mitigation and/or compensation for loss of badger foraging habitat
 - iii. Mitigation and/or compensation for loss of bat commuting and foraging habitat
 - iv. provision of reptile habitat enhancements
 - v. provision of Great Crested Newt mitigation and enhancement measures
 - vi. management of grassland, scrub and woodland habitats
 - (b) Numbers and locations of bat and bird boxes (including barn owl roost provision), including provision integral to the design of the new buildings.
 - (c) Aims and objectives of management
 - (d) Appropriate management options to achieve aims and objectives
 - (e) Preparation of a costed work schedule for securing biodiversity enhancements in perpetuity
 - (f) A timetable for implementation and details of ongoing monitoring and remedial measures.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed LEMP. Any and all mitigation measures identified shall be maintained thereafter in accordance with the agreed details.

- 26) Prior to the installation of any external lighting in connection with the development hereby approved, a 'Lighting Management Plan' shall be submitted to and approved in writing to the local planning authority. Thereafter, any external lighting shall be installed and maintained in complete accordance with the approved details.

- 27) Prior to commencement of development, a Construction Environmental Method Statement demonstrating how the Chiddingfold Forest Site of Scientific Interest (SSSI) will be protected during construction must be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. All works must then proceed in accordance with the approved statement with any amendments agreed in writing.
- 28) All construction works related to this permission (excluding internal works) must be completed outside the bird breeding season (1 March – 30 August), or, the site shall be inspected for active nests by a suitably qualified ecologist immediately prior to clearance works, and any active nests found left undisturbed with a buffer zone around them until confirmed by an ecologist that the nest is no longer in use.

Schedule of Conditions – Appeal B

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 371.03D; PLE/2016/1023.
- 3) The development hereby approved shall not be brought into use unless and until the proposed vehicular access to Dunsfold Road has been constructed and provided with visibility zones in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and thereafter the visibility zones shall be kept permanently clear of any obstruction measured 0.6m above the road surface.
- 4) The development hereby approved shall not be brought into use unless and until space has been laid out in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority for vehicles to be parked and for vehicles to turn so that they may enter and leave the site in forward gear. Thereafter the parking and turning areas shall be retained and maintained for their designated purposes.
- 5) The development hereby approved shall not be made available for public access, (including the laying of footpaths within the site) until full details and specifications for:
 - i. The proposed surfacing materials to be used within the site
 - ii. Any street furniture (to include sign posts, seating and associated infrastructure within the site)
 - iii. Any fencing or other means of enclosure within the sitehave been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out, and thereafter maintained, in complete accordance with the approved details.
- 6) Prior to the installation of any external lighting in connection with the development hereby approved, a 'Lighting Management Plan' shall be submitted to and approved in writing to the local planning authority. Thereafter, any external lighting shall be installed and maintained in complete accordance with the approved details.

- 7) Prior to the commencement of development, a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) based on the recommendations of Section 5 'Discussion, Recommendations and Conclusions' of the Ecological Appraisal report authored by Land Use Consultants dated August 2016, and to address the long-term management of the site, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The LEMP should include details of the following;
- (a) Description and evaluation of features to be managed and created including measures where necessary and appropriate for;
 - i. Mitigation and/or compensation for loss of proposed scrub, tree and hedge removal
 - ii. Mitigation and/or compensation for loss of badger foraging habitat
 - iii. Mitigation and/or compensation for loss of bat commuting and foraging habitat
 - iv. provision of reptile habitat enhancements
 - v. provision of Great Crested Newt mitigation and enhancement measures
 - vi. management of grassland, scrub and woodland habitats
 - (b) Numbers and locations of bat and bird boxes (including barn owl roost provision)
 - (c) Aims and objectives of management
 - (d) Appropriate management options to achieve aims and objectives
 - (e) Preparation of a costed work schedule for securing biodiversity enhancements in perpetuity
 - (f) A timetable for implementation and details of ongoing monitoring and remedial measures.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed LEMP. Any and all mitigation measures identified shall be maintained thereafter in accordance with the agreed details.